

From: CLHenman@cs.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:46 PM
Subject: Do Not Relax Broadcast Ownership Rules

The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Commissioner, FCC

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

I strongly urge that you not relax the broadcast ownership rules. Those rules are essential to protect American citizens from media monopolies. The threat of giant media conglomerates gaining predominant control of radio, television, and newspapers is very real and is fundamentally opposed to every concept of freedom in America. The very corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to bring about these changes have already engaged in attempts to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

There is no way these changes can be worth the risk to our basic freedoms, and if the majority of Americans were aware of the dangers, there would surely be an overwhelming backlash on this matter. The people of this nation deserve access to more than one viewpoint on important issues. The ownership protections that have served so well for so long should stay in place. Please use your influence to keep the mega-media conglomerates out.

With highest regards,
Carl Henman, Garden Grove, California

From: Grace Hale
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, FCC FCCINFO
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 48 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I am writing to let you know how opposed I and many other Americans are to the proposed deregulation of the media. Democracy will not, indeed does not work when media ownership is concentrated in the hands of a few companies. Please postpone your Monday meeting and take the time to ask the American people, not just the media corporations, about these changes.

Sincerely,

Grace Hale

--

Grace Elizabeth Hale
Associate Professor of History
University of Virginia
(on leave)

2002-2003 Fellow
National Humanities Center
7 Alexander Dr
PO Box 12256
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2256
919 549 0668 ext 112

From: Jane Young
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 49 PM
Subject: REPUBLICAN PARTY AGENDA AIRWAVE DOMINATION

THE AIRWAVES BELONG TO THE PUBLIC!!!!!!!!!! NOT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY!!!!!!
FIND SOME OTHER WAY TO PROMOTE THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
THIS STINKS AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY LOOKS BAD!!!!!!!!!!

From: Fred Rees
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:50 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules

My wife and I are absolutely apposed to the relaxing of "broadcast Ownership rules".

We urge you NOT to relax said rules

WE are WATCHING NRA

Fred Rees Sr

Pasadena, CA

From: Larry Harris
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:52 PM
Subject: Please DO NOT change FCC broadcast ownership rules

Mrs. Abernathy,
Please DO NOT change the Broadcast Ownership Rules and Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio and Broadcast Stations! If you do, only a few companies will control the news and information that will be received by 80% of the people. The internet is not an alternative, when only 20% of the people pursue alternatives. Democracy is undermined when 80% of the voting population receives their news from only a few companies

From: Larry Harris
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 54 PM
Subject: Please DO NOT change FCC broadcast ownership rules

Mr. Powell,
Please DO NOT change the Broadcast Ownership Rules and Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio and Broadcast Stations! If you do, only a few companies will control the news and information that will be received by 80% of the people. The internet is not an alternative, when only 20% of the people pursue alternatives. Democracy is undermined when 80% of the voting population receives their news from only a few companies

Larry Harris
Belmont, California

From: Marc Duvivier
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:56 PM
Subject: 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review

re. 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (MB Docket No 02-277), Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers (MM Docket No. 01-235), Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets (MM Docket No 01-317), and Definition of Radio Markets (MM Docket No 00-244)

I am writing as a private citizen to urge the FCC to vote against adopting the proposed rule changes that will be presented on Monday, June 2, 2003

The opinions expressed herein are my own and do not necessarily represent those of my employer Wavexpress, or our parent companies Sarnoff Corporation and Wave Systems, Inc

I would also request that, if permissible, you keep my correspondence private.

I am working for a joint venture that has spent four years and over \$30,000,000 dollars trying to establish a technology platform that would vastly increase consumers quality and choice while dramatically reducing their costs for video programming. During that time I have seen first hand how the existing barriers are virtually insurmountable for new companies to ford. Specifically, the vertical integration of large corporations and their co-mingled interests (even when they are competitive in some markets) results in a lack of equal access to distribution networks and creates enormous barriers to obtaining quality programming. Although we are currently delivering DVD and HD quality programming across the Internet, including a DVD quality "personal TV channel" of presidential candidate Howard Dean (<http://www.howarddean.tv>), we have been unable to obtain any of the partnerships that would be expected if a true competitive market exists.

We started in the DTV space, where we determined after 18 months that there was little chance that broadcasters would ever act aggressively to deploy new technologies, because the system of licenses and regulation reduced both their incentives and ability (due to a poorly chosen modulation standard) to do so. 24 months later we know we were correct in our decision - lip service to broadcasters deploying digital television notwithstanding, most consumers have no real new services or choice in service providers in spite of the billions of dollars in public bandwidth made available to broadcasters.

At that time we switched to a strategy that focused on deploying over broadband, because our technology is particularly well suited to cable and satellite networks.

We could reduce our Internet distribution costs dramatically if we were permitted to utilize an Internet standard called IP Multicast across the networks of cable or satellite companies, but they will not provide this access because it would allow competition with their own programming products and services. Consumer pay \$30-\$50 a month for Internet access through some of these companies, but they are effectively permitted to decide who gets access to those consumers by controlling which Internet standards we are allowed to use. The same is true in satellite, where firms with integrated programming have no interest in allowing new companies to reach their customers with new or cheaper services that are not controlled by them.

We could provide digital distribution of DVD or HD quality video to any broadband enabled consumer in the country today, but we have been unable to secure rights from content providers. While they will cite a range of reasons, such as content security, we have demonstrated that we can address these concerns. The real issue is not addressing their concerns, however, but that these companies have inadequate incentive to allow their content to traverse new distribution paths. Example of this abound, such as Intertainer's inability to get movie rights while major studios set up their own competitive offering, Movielink.

It is self-evident that in a competitive world, distribution companies would want to embrace technologies that reduced costs on their network by orders of magnitude, and content companies would be anxious to supply content over new distribution channels. That they are not doing so is prima facie evidence that a true competitive market does not exist.

It is my belief that the proposed changes will make this situation worse.

It is clear to me that a competitive landscape would separately regulate distribution providers and content providers, and require transparency and equal access to their offerings for service providers. If this were the case, I believe we or one of our competitors would be able to offer 5,000 channels of DVD and HD quality programming for as little as \$2.00 per month, today, and anyone who had an idea or opinion that they wanted to express would be able to cost effectively create their own forum for all to see.

This is the essence of free speech, not merely the right to talk, but the ability to be heard. While I am agreed that the current rules regarding broadcasters are outdated, the proposed revisions are a step in the wrong direction; the proposed rule changes will stifle smaller voices.

In the age of digital distribution and powerful receivers with massive storage capabilities, there is no reason that the original broadcaster model should survive. The consumer will be best served if their service providers are able to select from a wide content and distribution offering, and the consumer is able to select amongst the service providers to obtain what they want - no more, no less.

Respectfully,

Marc Duvivier

VP/Chief Technologist

Wavexpress, Inc

From: mdolan34001@bvmcong.org
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 56 PM
Subject: Don't allow big media to get even bigger

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

On June 2, you will vote on a proposal to allow the same company to own newspapers, and television and radio stations in local communities. This multiple ownership will create a monopoly of information that threatens a diverse, independent, and competitive media. The concentration of ownership is not in the interest of an informed citizenry necessary in a democratic society.

I urge you to support democracy by voting against this proposed rule. Don't allow big media to get even bigger.

Sincerely,
Mary Ellen Dolan, BVM
Dubuque, IA

From: john
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 57 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Why does this administration continue to reject the views of the people? Don't weaken the rules of the FCC!!!!!!!!!!!!

John J Wilken

From: Kip Cherry
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:58 PM
Subject: In Opposition to a Rules Vote on June 2

Dear Commissioners,

I appreciate that the comment period has been extended through May 30. I would like to add my voice to a postponement of the vote on the FCC Merger Rules. I believe that a vote to change the rules could be one of the final nails in the coffin of our Democracy. This is ironic especially when one of the reasons for our invasion of Iraq was to supposedly give the Iraqi people a chance at Democracy.

I understand that there is an attitude at the FCC that it only wants to hear from experts. I am an expert. I am an expert consumer. And I am finding it very difficult to obtain information on what my government is doing or proposes to do. One reason may be that the government does want me or other Americans to know. I hope that the FCC is not in this category, but I fear that it might be. I understand that there is a 250-page report on what the FCC is proposing in its rule change and that the FCC has not been made available to the public. How can members of the public comment on something that no one has seen? Is that Democratic?

Mr. Powell says that he has spent several hours with the record. Frankly that period doesn't sound very long considering that 18,000 people and organizations have supposedly contributed to it. More than that I would like to spend a few hours myself with the record, so I know what it says. I appreciate the fact that Mr. Powell is saving me the time, but I would rather see for myself so that I can express my own views on what it says.

I couldn't agree more with Chairman Powell's comment: "If we adopt rules that do not peer through the eyes and listen through the ears of consumers and see how they obtain news and information, then it is questionable whether we are truly acting in their stead, or merely using their name in vein to promote some other agenda." I think, in fact that you are using my name in vein, and I object to it. I object vehemently.

The reason that I am having trouble figuring out what is going on may be that there is not enough competition among the media to obtain and disseminate this information. I am seeing increasing evidence of this on a daily basis. Before loosening the rules on mergers we should really look at this.

Chairman Powell says that, "the market trends are against free TV. By our last cable competition report, over 85% of households subscribe to cable or DBS-opting to pay for television." I find it hard to believe that 85% of all households subscribe to cable. It's very expensive to subscribe to cable. Unreasonably expensive. (Maybe another indication that there increasingly less competition in the media.) I find it very hard to believe that only 15% of households DO NOT subscribe. Are you certain of your numbers? Maybe we can agree then, that AT LEAST 15% of the population, unless they are avid newspaper readers, have little access to news. This might work well in a totalitarian country, but is not my idea of Democracy.

For me, I don't find free TV very informative or very entertaining. The major problem with free TV is that the programming has deteriorated. And, from what I can tell, everyone agrees that programming on free TV has deteriorated. The question is why.

I think that free TV has deteriorated because competition has decreased. In my own business, competition has become more fierce and each competitor is trying harder and harder to offer better product. In my industry each competitor knows that it is certain failure is to offer mediocre product. Each of us is constantly trying to do better to meet the desires of the consumer. Conversely, Chairman Powell has stated "I do not think concentration itself is the root cause of the quality of content we see today, I think that fierce competition is." Wow! Could this be true?

My concern is that the members of the FCC are rushing this vote. Not all members, just three members. The other two, as I understand it actually requested an extension, but were turned down by the Chairman, after polling the other two members. I am appalled that the other two members did not have more respect for the concerns of their fellow Commissioners.

Mr. Powell says that "the Commission overreached twice in setting EEO obligations. Twice the rules were overturned as unconstitutional." He says "that the case for change, however, is not merely a response to an unfavorable court ruling or two." This seems like double talk to me. Am I missing something here? Is he saying that changing the rules will HELP diversity? Changing the rules to allow MORE media mergers will NOT support greater diversity in the media. On May 19, Chairman Powell announced the intention of the FCC to form a Federal Advisory Committee to Assist the FCC in Addressing Diversity Issues. It seems to me that the first step would be to postpone any change in the Rules that would allow further consolidation in the media.

Until now I have been one of those who has not yet been able to articulate a good letter outlining my objections to a change in the FCC rules and I know that time is of the essence, and I do object. Suffice it to say that I am very concerned about the impact of media mergers on the ability for each of us to obtain information so that we can act responsibly as citizens. Without information, I don't think we will be able to sustain our Democracy, and as an avid newspaper reader (particularly the New York Times), radio listener, late night and Sunday morning TV watcher, and internet user, I am finding it more and more difficult to become informed on legislative issues before it is too late to act. Hence, my late communication on the FCC rules. It is my belief that there is less and less competition in the media and that the media is becoming less and less informational.

Just a few examples of why I am so concerned are:

Radio is becoming a diminishing source of local news and information. The recent Clear Channel failure to provide mandated emergency information during a chemical spill event is one example. I have also noticed that Public Radio, in an effort to provide a "balanced" approach, it has also just become less informative. Its coverage of the FCC rule changes has been very weak.

The internet and cable television, while they appear to provide additional competition, have not picked up the slack. In addition, the cost of both is prohibitive to many people. The internet is still in its infancy. Its information is not checked by editors and it is not reliable. Much of it is not very detailed. Until recently I was receiving a helpful and objective internet daily newsletter called the NandoTimes. For unexplained reasons, the NandoTimes has just discontinued its newsletter.

In the area of cable television, it is not providing the public programming we had all anticipated in granting regional cable monopolies. Perhaps this should be rethought. And there are other problems with cable, beyond its expense. Recently, an independent filmmaker filmed an advertisement in which a group of citizens expressed their concerns about the War in Iraq. He had purchased and paid for "air" time, only to be told, the day before, that the cable company, Comcast, would not carry the ad. I believe that a complaint has been filed with the FCC on this, but no reply has been received.

Please add my comments to the public record."

Thank you very much.

Kathleen P. Cherry

4807 Ravens Crest
Plainsboro, New Jersey 08540
609-716-4940

From: rsweeney
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 11 01 PM
Subject: Please postpone the June 2nd vote!

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider postponing your June 2nd vote to authorize greater concentration of ownership of media in our nation. There is already painfully little debate of important issues on the radio or television. with the one ray of sunshine in Pacifica

It seems that the greater the concentration within the public media of institutions whose goal is profit, the less consideration of the wealth of diverse opinions that our nation has establish as one of our principle expressions of freedom. A vote to further concentrate the ownership of media will certainly exacerbate this very disturbing trend

Thank you very much

Randy Sweeney (rsweeney@lausd.k12.ca.us)
Science Teacher, Jefferson High School (www.lausd.k12.ca.us/Jefferson_HS)
Los Angeles Unified School District (www.lausd.k12.ca.us)
the more i learn
the more i realize ..
that there is so much more to know!

CC: rsweeney@lausd.k12.ca.us

From: Joel Hagemeyer
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 6 49 PM
Subject: Stop Media Deregulation - Delay vote until public can comment

Dear Michael Powell,

I urge you and your colleagues on the commission to promote a diverse, balanced, and competitive media. Please delay the FCC rule change on June 2 until your commission can receive public input.

It is more important than ever that we try to help the media foster diverse points of view, and not get locked down into a narrow spectrum of opinion. If we want to address the world in a fair, informed, and successful way, we need to hear what the world really thinks. We need to hear viewpoints other than those coming from our leaders. We need to hear the news that those in power do not want us to hear. *A nation of sheep, in the long run, is a weakened and vulnerable nation. Narrow views perpetuated by a narrow media will result in our undoing.*

We allow media companies to use the airwaves in exchange for their assurance that they're serving the *public interest*, and it's the FCC's job to make sure that's so. Please hold this mandate in mind, delay the rule change vote until public input can be taken into account.

Sincerely,
Joel Hagemeyer

13714 26th Ave NE

Seattle, WA 98125

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: alkellon@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear FCC Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

cc my members of Congress

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to delay the unnecessarily rushed vote on media ownership scheduled for June 2nd.

Sincerely,

Anita L. Kellon
Anita Kellon
4379 Brooks RD
Cleveland, OH 44105

From: Laurie Fiorito
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Oppose Media Mergers

June 7, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I know you are busy. But prior to your vote on June 2, stop for a moment to consider this.

Imagine if America's news media emphasized solutions, rather than problems. Imagine if America's top journalists were paid to inform, rather than titillate, dramatize, and report anything as "news" to boost ratings.

If you support this vision, you will vote against allowing giant media corporations to grow even bigger. For example, I think it's dangerous for one company to own both the leading daily newspaper (often the only daily newspaper) and a local TV station in the same city. This ownership arrangement puts too much power in the hands of one media corporation-and it reduces the already small number of independent media voices we hear in our communities.

Please join with all your colleagues and act now to stop big media from getting even bigger.

Sincerely,

Laurie Fiorito
16 Gregory Court
Stroudsburg, PA 18360
USA
Rie356@hotmail.com

From: eantony@csbsju.edu
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear FCC Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

cc. my members of Congress

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to delay the unnecessarily rushed vote on media ownership scheduled for June 2nd

Sincerely,

Eunice Antony
Eunice Antony
104 Chapel Lane
St Joseph, MN 56374

From: linda reiger
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Oppose Media Mergers

June 6, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I know you are busy. But prior to your vote on June 2, stop for a moment to consider this.

Imagine if America's news media emphasized solutions, rather than problems. Imagine if America's top journalists were paid to inform, rather than titillate, dramatize, and report anything as "news" to boost ratings.

If you support this vision, you will vote against allowing giant media corporations to grow even bigger. For example, I think it's dangerous for one company to own both the leading daily newspaper (often the only daily newspaper) and a local TV station in the same city. This ownership arrangement puts too much power in the hands of one media corporation and it reduces the already small number of independent media voices we hear in our communities.

Please join with all your colleagues and act now to stop big media from getting even bigger.

Sincerely,

linda reiger
9640 adams st
Elk Grove, CA 95624
USA
satsteacher@hotmail.com

From: Mary McKeon
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4 18 PM
Subject: Oppose Media Mergers

June 6, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I know you are busy. But prior to your vote on June 2, stop for a moment to consider this:
Imagine if America's news media emphasized solutions, rather than problems.
Imagine if America's top journalists were paid to inform, rather than titillate, dramatize, and report anything as "news" to boost ratings.

If you support this vision, you will vote against allowing giant media corporations to grow even bigger. For example, I think it's dangerous for one company to own *both the leading daily newspaper (often the only daily newspaper) and a local TV station in the same city*. This ownership arrangement puts too much power in the hands of one media corporation-and it reduces the already small number of independent media voices we hear in our communities.

Please join with all your colleagues and act now to stop big media from getting even bigger.

Sincerely,

Mary McKeon
270 Searles Rd
Margaretville, NY 12455
USA
maryfh007@catskill.net

From: mammyorr@cox.net
To: KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules

Before you vote on June 2nd to loosen media ownership rules, please take a moment to consider what effect such a move will have on program content

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins

Further deregulation will not mean greater opportunity for competition. Rather, it will mean the opposite. More control of the airwaves by the few, with even less accountability to the market than they demonstrate today.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be damned.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a handful of major conglomerates. Please do not relax the media ownership rules.

Sincerely,

Donald & Sonja Orr

From: synying@yahoo.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear FCC Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

cc my members of Congress

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to delay the unnecessarily rushed vote on media ownership scheduled for June 2nd.

Sincerely,
Stella Strand
3565 First Ave #E
San Diego, CA 92103

From: linda reiger
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4 18 PM
Subject: Oppose Media Mergers

June 6, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I know you are busy. But prior to your vote on June 2, stop for a moment to *consider this*:

Imagine if America's news media emphasized solutions, rather than problems.
Imagine if America's top journalists were paid to inform, rather than titillate,
dramatize, and report anything as "news" to boost ratings.

If you support this vision, you will vote against allowing giant media corporations to grow even bigger. For example, I think it's dangerous for one company to own both the leading daily newspaper (often the only daily newspaper) and a local TV station in the same city. This ownership arrangement *puts too much power in* the hands of one media corporation-and it reduces the already small number of independent media voices we hear in our communities.

Please join with all your colleagues and act now to stop big media from getting even bigger.

Sincerely,

Linda Reiger
9640 Adams St
Elk Grove, CA 95624
USA
satsteacher@hotmail.com

From: Jeff Gurule
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Oppose Media Mergers

June 7, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I know you are busy. But prior to your vote on June 2, stop for a moment to consider this. Imagine if America's news media emphasized solutions, rather than problems. Imagine if America's top journalists were paid to inform, rather than titillate, dramatize, and report anything as "news" to boost ratings.

If you support this vision, you will vote against allowing giant media corporations to grow even bigger. For example, I think it's dangerous for one company to own both the leading daily newspaper (often the only daily newspaper) and a local TV station in the same city. This ownership arrangement puts too much power in the hands of one media corporation-and it reduces the already small number of independent media voices we hear in our communities.

Please join with all your colleagues and act now to stop big media from getting even bigger.

Sincerely,

Jeff Gurule
60085 Cascadel Rd
North Fork, CA 93643
USA
cfwizardboy@hotmail.com

From: john.nichols.1969@alum.bu.edu
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear FCC Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

cc: my members of Congress

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by reversing the FCC's decision to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership. If you do not, Congress should pass a law overturning the action and restore diversity to media ownership.

Sincerely,

John Nichols
John Nichols
PMB 312, 1945 N. Carson St
Carson City, NV 89701

From: john.nichols.1969@alum bu edu
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4 18 PM
Subject: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear FCC Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

cc. my members of Congress

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by reversing the FCC's decision to end *critical safeguards* designed to ensure *diversity of media ownership*. If you do not, Congress should pass a law overturning the action and restore diversity to media ownership.

Sincerely,

John Nichols
John Nichols
PMB 312, 1945 N. Carson St
Carson City, NV 89701